arXiv:1503.07262v1 [math.PR] 25 Mar 2015

Convergence rates for subcritical threshold-one contact processes on lattices

Xiaofeng Xue *
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

Abstract:

In this paper we are concerned with threshold-one contact processes on lattices. We show that the probability that the origin is infected converges to 0 at an exponential rate I in the subcritical case. Furthermore, we give a limit theorem for I as the degree of the lattice grows to infinity. Our results also hold for classic contact processes on lattices.

Keywords: contact process, threshold, convergence rate, random walk.

1 Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with threshold-one contact processes on lattices $\mathbb{Z}^d, d = 1, 2, \ldots$ For any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we write $x \sim y$ when there is an edge connecting these two vertices. We say that x and y are neighbors when $x \sim y$.

The threshold-one contact process $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is with state space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. In other words, at each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ there is a spin taking value 0 or 1. For each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $t > 0$, the spin at x at moment t is denoted by $\eta_t(x)$. Furthermore, we define $\eta_{t-}(x)$ as

$$\eta_{t-}(x) := \lim_{s<t, s\uparrow t} \eta_s(x).$$

Hence $\eta_{t-}(x)$ is the spin at x at the moment just before t.

$\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ evolves according to independent Poisson processes $\{N_x(t) : t \geq 0\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $\{Y_x(t) : t \geq 0\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$. For each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, N_x is with rate 1 and Y_x is with rate λ, where $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter called the infection rate. At $t = 0$, each spin takes a value from $\{0, 1\}$ according to some probability distribution. Then, for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the spin at x may flip only at event times of N_x and Y_x. For

---

[*] **E-mail**: xuexiaofeng@ucas.ac.cn **Address**: School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China.

any event time s of N_x, $\eta_s(x) = 0$ no matter whatever $\eta_{s-}(x)$ is. For any event time r of Y_x, if $\eta_{r-}(x) = 1$, then $\eta_r(x) = 1$. If $\eta_{r-}(x) = 0$, then $\eta_r(x) = 1$ when and only when at least one neighbor y of x satisfies $\eta_{r-}(y) = 1$.

Therefore, $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is a spin system (see Chapter 3 of [6]) with flip rates function given by

$$c(x,\eta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \eta(x) = 1, \\ \lambda & \text{if } \eta(x) = 0 \text{ and } \sum_{y:y\sim x} \eta(y) \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

for any $(x,\eta) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$.

Intuitively, the threshold-one contact process describes the spread of an infected disease. Vertices with spin 1 are infected individuals while vertices with spin 0 are healthy. An infected vertex waits for an exponential time with rate one to become healthy while a healthy vertex is infected by neighbors with rate λ when at least one neighbor is infected.

Our main result in this paper about the threshold-one contact process $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ also holds for the classic contact process $\{\beta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. The flip rates function of β_t is given by

$$\widehat{c}(x,\beta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta(x) = 1, \\ \lambda \sum_{y:y\sim x} \eta(y) & \text{if } \beta(x) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

for any $(x,\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. The main difference between η_t and β_t is that for β_t, a healthy vertex is infected at rate proportional to the number of infected neighbors.

The threshold-one contact processes is introduced in [2] by Cox and Durrett as a tool to study threshold voter models (see Part two of [8] and [1, 5, 7, 10, 12]). [2] gives an important dual relationship between the threshold-one contact process and an additive Markov processes. According to this dual relationship, [2] shows that the critical value $\lambda_c(d)$ for the threshold-one contact process on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfies $\lambda_c(d) \leq 2.18/d$. [11] develops this result by showing that $\lim_{d\to+\infty} 2d\lambda_c(d) = 1$. In recent years, there are some works concerned with threshold contact processes with threshold $K > 1$. [9] shows that the critical value $\lambda_c(d,K)$ for the threshold $K > 1$ contact process on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfies $\lim_{d\to+\infty} \lambda_c(d,K) = 0$. [3] shows that the same conclusion holds for the case on regular trees $\mathbb{T}^N$ and gives the rate at which $\lambda_c(\mathbb{T}^N, K)$ converges to 0 as N grows to infinity.

2 Main result

In this section, we will give the main result of this paper. First we introduce some notations. For $d \geq 1$ and $\lambda > 0$, we denote by $P_{\lambda,d}$ the probability measure of the threshold-one contact process $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with infection rate λ. We denote by $E_{\lambda,d}$ the expectation operator with respect to $P_{\lambda,d}$. We write η_t as η_t^η when

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_0 = \eta) = 1$$

for some $\eta \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. We denote by δ_1 and δ_0 configurations in $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that

$$\delta_1(x) = 1,\ \delta_0(x) = 0$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We denote by O the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and denote by e_1 the unit vector $(1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

Since the threshold-one contact process is attractive (see Chapter 3 of [6]), for any $t > s$ and $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$,

$$P_{\lambda_1,d}(\eta_s^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) \geq P_{\lambda_2,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1).$$

As a result, it is reasonable to define the following critical value.

$$\lambda_c(d) := \sup\{\lambda : \lim_{t\to+\infty} P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = 0\} \tag{2.1}$$

for $d \geq 1$.

When $\lambda < \lambda_c(d)$, the process η_t converges weakly to δ_0 as $t \to +\infty$, which is called the subcritical case.

In the subcritical case, we are concerned with the rate at which the probability that O is infected converges to 0 as the time t grows to infinity. To introduce our main result, we give a lemma at first.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $d \geq 1$, there exists $I(\lambda, d) \in [-\infty, 0]$ such that*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = I(\lambda, d). \tag{2.2}$$

After giving λ a proper scale, we obtain the following limit theorem of $I(\lambda, d)$ as our main result.

Theorem 2.2. *For any $\lambda \geq 0$,*

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} I\big(\frac{\lambda}{d},\ d\big) = \begin{cases} 2\lambda - 1 & \text{if } \lambda \in [0, 1/2], \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda > 1/2. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Theorem 2.2 shows that for subcritical threshold-one contact process with infection rate λ, the probability that O is infected converges to 0 as $t \to +\infty$ at an exponential rate approximate to $2\lambda d - 1$ when the dimension d is sufficiently large.

According to the dual relationship introduced in [2], there is an intuitive explanation for Theorem 2.2. When the dimension d is large, the threshold-one contact process is similar with a branching process such that each particle generates $2d$ particles at rate λ or dies at rate one. The mean of the sum of the particles at t is $\exp\{(2\lambda d - 1)t\}$.

In Theorem 2.2, the case where $\lambda > 1/2$ is trivial, since [11] shows that

$$\lim_{d \to +\infty} 2d\lambda_c(d) = 1.$$

Similar conclusion with Theorem 2.2 holds for the classic contact process $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$, the flip rate function of which is given in (1.2).

Theorem 2.3. *For any $\lambda \geq 0$ and $d \geq 1$, there exists $J(\lambda, d) \in [-\infty, 0]$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = J(\lambda, d)$$

and

$$\lim_{d \to +\infty} J(\frac{\lambda}{d},\ d) = \begin{cases} 2\lambda - 1 & \text{if } \lambda \in [0, 1/2], \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda > 1/2. \end{cases}$$

In this paper, the proof of theorem about β_t is similar with that of the counterpart conclusion about η_t. We will give all the details in the proof of theorem about η_t and give just a sketch for the proof of theorem about β_t.

At the end of this section, we give the proof of Lemma 2.1. The proof of Theorem 2.2 is divide into Section 3 and Section 4.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We utilize the dual relationship introduced in [2]. Let $\{A_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a Markov process with state space

$$2^{\mathbb{Z}^d} := \{A : A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d\}$$

and flip rate functions

$$A_t \to \begin{cases} A_t \setminus x & \text{at rate } 1, \\ A_t \cup \{y : y \sim x\} & \text{at rate } \lambda \end{cases}$$

for any $t \geq 0$ and each $x \in A_t$.

We write A_t as A_t^A when $A_0 = A$. Then, according to [2], there is a dual relationship between $\{\eta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = P_{\lambda,d}(A_t^O \neq \emptyset). \tag{2.4}$$

As a result, according to strong Markov property,

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_{t+s}^{\delta_1}(O)=1)=P_{\lambda,d}(A_{t+s}^{O}\neq\emptyset)=E_{\lambda,d}\Big[P_{\lambda,d}\big(A_s^{A_t}\neq\emptyset\big);A_t^O\neq\emptyset\Big]. \qquad (2.5)$$

Since A_t is symmetric for Z^d and is a monotone process under the partial order that $A\geq B$ if and only if $A\supseteq B$,

$$P_{\lambda,d}\big(A_s^{A_t}\neq\emptyset\big)\geq P_{\lambda,d}(A_s^O\neq\emptyset) \qquad (2.6)$$

on the event $\{A_t\neq\emptyset\}$.

By (2.5) and (2.6),

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_{t+s}^{\delta_1}(O)=1)&\geq P_{\lambda,d}(A_t^O\neq\emptyset)P_{\lambda,d}(A_s^O\neq\emptyset)\\&=P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_s^{\delta_1}(O)=1)\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_{t+s}^{\delta_1}(O)=1)\geq\log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)+\log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_s^{\delta_1}(O)=1) \qquad (2.7)$$

for any $t,s\geq 0$.

The existence of $I(\lambda,d)$ follows from (2.7) and Fekete's Subadditive Lemma. By Fekete's Subadditive Lemma,

$$I(\lambda,d)=\sup_{t\geq 0}\frac{1}{t}\log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1).$$

□

The proof of the existence of $J(\lambda,d)$ is nearly the same as that of $I(\lambda,d)$ by the self-duality of $\{\beta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ introduced in Theorem 6.1.7 of [6].

Proof of the existence of $J(\lambda,d)$. Let $C_t=\{x\in Z^d:\beta_t(x)=1\}$ and write C_t as C_t^A when $C_0=A$, then according to Theorem 6.1.7 of [6],

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)=P_{\lambda,d}(C_t^O\neq\emptyset). \qquad (2.8)$$

The existence of $J(\lambda,d)$ follows from (2.8) and a similar analysis with that after (2.4) in the proof of Lemma 2.1.

□

3 Upper bound

In this section we will give upper bounds for $I(\lambda/d,\ d)$ and $J(\lambda/d,\ d)$.

The proofs of Theorem 2.2 for cases where $\lambda=0$ and $\lambda>1/2$ are trivial. According to [11],

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty}2d\lambda_c(d)=1.$$

As a result, for $\lambda > 1/2$ and sufficiently large d, $\lambda_c(d) < \lambda/d$ and

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} P_{\lambda/d,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = K(\lambda, d) > 0.$$

Therefore,

$$I(\lambda/d, d) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\lambda/d,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = 0$$

for $\lambda > 1/2$ and sufficiently large d.

The above analysis also holds for $J(\lambda/d,\ d)$ since [4] shows that the critical value $\widehat{\lambda}_c(d)$ for the classic contact process $\{\beta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ on Z^d satisfies

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} 2d\widehat{\lambda}_c(d) = 1.$$

When $\lambda = 0$, O waits for an exponential time with rate one to become healthy and will never be infected again. Hence,

$$P_{0,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = P_{0,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = e^{-t}$$

and

$$I(0, d) = J(0, d) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \log e^{-t} = -1.$$

Now we only need to deal with the case where $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. The following lemma gives an upper bound for $I(\lambda, d)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $\lambda > 0$ and $d \geq 1$,*

$$\max\{I(\lambda, d),\ J(\lambda, d)\} \leq 2\lambda d - 1.$$

As a direct corollary,

$$\max\Big\{\limsup_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d, d),\ \ \limsup_{d\to+\infty} J(\lambda/d, d)\Big\} \leq 2\lambda - 1$$

for $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. According to the flip rate functions of $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ given in (1.1) and Hille-Yosida Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) = &- P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) \\
&+ \lambda P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 0, \exists\ y \sim O, \eta_t^{\delta_1}(y) = 1) \\
&\leq -P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) + \lambda P_{\lambda,d}(\exists\ y \sim O, \eta_t^{\delta_1}(y) = 1) \\
&\leq -P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) + \lambda \sum_{y: y\sim O} P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(y) = 1) \\
&= (2\lambda d - 1) P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1),
\end{aligned}$$

since O has $2d$ neighbors and $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is symmetric for Z^d.

Then, according to Grönwall's inequality,

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)\leq e^{(2\lambda d-1)t}P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_0^{\delta_1}(O)=1)=e^{(2\lambda d-1)t}$$

and hence

$$I(\lambda,d)=\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{1}{t}\log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)\leq 2\lambda d-1.$$

The analysis for $J(\lambda,d)$ is similar. According to the flip rate functions given in (1.2),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)&=-P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)\\&\quad+\lambda\sum_{y:y\sim O}P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=0,\beta_t^{\delta_1}(y)=1)\\&\leq -P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)+\lambda\sum_{y:y\sim O}P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(y)=1).\end{aligned}$$

Then $J(\lambda,d)\leq 2\lambda d-1$ follows from the same analysis as that of $I(\lambda,d)$.

□

4 Lower bound

In this section we will give lower bounds for $I(\lambda/d,\ d)$ and $J(\lambda/d,\ d)$ for $\lambda\in(0,1/2)$. The main tool we utilize is a Markov process $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ with state space $[0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ introduced in [11]. In other words, for $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$, there is a spin at each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ taking a nonnegative value.

Let $\{N_x(t):t\geq 0\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $\{Y_x(t):t\geq 0\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be the same Poisson processes as that in Section 1. $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ evolves according to $\{N_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $\{Y_x\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$. At $t=0$, $\zeta_0(x)>0$ for each $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. For any event time s of N_x, $\zeta_s(x)=0$ no matter whatever $\zeta_{s-}(x)$ is. For any event time r of Y_x, $\zeta_r(x)=\zeta_{r-}(x)+\sum_{y:y\sim x}\zeta_{r-}(y)$. Between any adjacent event times of Poisson processes, $\zeta_t(x)$ evolves according to deterministic ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt}\zeta_t(x)=(1-2\lambda d)\zeta_t(x).$$

In other words, if there is no event time of N_x or Y_x in $[t_1,t_2]$, then

$$\zeta_{t_2}(x)=\zeta_{t_1}(x)\exp\{(1-2\lambda d)(t_2-t_1)\}. \tag{4.1}$$

It is useful for us to give the generator of $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. For any $\zeta\in[0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $m\in[0,+\infty)$, we define $U(\zeta,x)=\zeta(x)+\sum_{y:y\sim x}\zeta(y)$ and define

$\zeta^{x,m} \in [0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ as

$$\zeta^{x,m}(y) = \begin{cases} \zeta(y) & \text{if } y \neq x, \\ m & \text{if } y = x. \end{cases}$$

Then, the generator Ω of $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega f(\zeta) = & \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \left[f(\zeta^{x,0}) - f(\zeta)\right] + \lambda \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \left[f(\zeta^{x,U(\zeta,x)}) - f(\zeta)\right] \\ & + (1-2\lambda d)\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f'_x(\zeta)\zeta(x) \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

for $f \in C([0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d})$, where $f'_x(\zeta)$ is the partial derivative of $f(\zeta)$ with respect to the coordinate $\zeta(x)$.

The following lemmas are crucial for us to give lower bound for $I(\lambda, d)$.

Lemma 4.1. *There is a coupling of $\eta_t^{\delta_1}$ and ζ_t such that*

$$\eta_t^{\delta_1}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \zeta_t(x) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \zeta_t(x) = 0 \end{cases}$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $t \geq 0$.

Proof. For any $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define

$$\widetilde{\eta}_t(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \zeta_t(x) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \zeta_t(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\widetilde{\eta}_0 = \delta_1$. At any event time s of N_x, $\zeta_s(x) = 0$ and hence $\widetilde{\eta}_s(x) = 0$. At any event time r of Y_x, $\widetilde{\eta}(x)$ flips from 0 to 1 if and only if $\zeta_r(x) = 0 + \sum_{y:y\sim x}\zeta_{r-}(y) > 0$. In other words, conditioned on $\widetilde{\eta}_{r-}(x) = 0$, $\widetilde{\eta}_r(x) = 1$ if and only if at least one neighbor y of x satisfies $\zeta_{r-}(y) > 0$ and meanwhile $\widetilde{\eta}_{r-}(y) = 1$. According to ODE (4.1), between any adjacent event times of Poisson processes N_x and Y_x, $\zeta_t(x)$ can not flip from positive value to zero or flip from zero to positive value, which makes $\widetilde{\eta}_t(x)$ still.

Therefore, $\{\widetilde{\eta}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ evolves in the same way as that of $\{\eta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. Since $\widetilde{\eta}_0 = \eta_0^{\delta_1} = \delta_1$, $\{\widetilde{\eta}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_t^{\delta_1}\}_{t\geq 0}$ have the same distribution.

□

Lemma 4.2. *When $\zeta_0 = \zeta$ where $\zeta(x) > 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then there exists $C(\lambda, d, \zeta) > 0$ such that*

$$E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(O) \geq C(\lambda, d, \zeta)t^{-\frac{d}{2}}$$

for any $t \geq 0$.

Proof. According to the generator of $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ given in (4.2) and Theorem 9.1.27 of [6],

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(x) &= -E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(x)+\lambda\sum_{y:y\sim x}E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(y)+(1-2\lambda d)E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(x)\\ &=\lambda\sum_{y:y\sim x}E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(y)-2\lambda dE_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(x) \qquad (4.3)\end{aligned}$$

for each $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Let $Q=\big(q(x,y)\big)_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be the Q-matrix of the continuous time simple random walk on Z^d such that

$$q(x,y)=\begin{cases}\lambda & \text{if } y\sim x,\\ -2\lambda d & \text{if } y=x,\\ 0 & \text{else,}\end{cases}$$

then, by (4.3),

$$E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t=P_t\zeta_0,$$

where

$$P_t=\big(p_t(x,y)\big)_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d}=e^{tQ}=\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty}\frac{t^nQ^n}{n!}.$$

In other words, P_t is the transition function of the simple random walk with Q-matrix Q.

According to classic theory of continuous time simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, there exists $C>0$ such that

$$p_t(O,O)\geq[C(\lambda t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}]^d$$

for any $t\geq 0$, where C does not depend on λ and d.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(O)&=\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}p_t(O,x)\zeta_0(x)\geq p_t(O,O)\zeta_0(O)\\ &\geq\zeta_0(O)[C(\lambda t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}]^d.\end{aligned}$$

Let $C(\lambda,d,\zeta)=\zeta_0(O)C^d\lambda^d$, then the proof is completed.

□

We define $F:[0,+\infty)\to[0,+\infty)^{Z^d}$ as

$$F_t(x)=E_{\lambda,d}\big[\zeta_t(O)\zeta_t(x)\big] \qquad (4.4)$$

for any $t\geq 0$ and $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, the following lemma holds for F.

Lemma 4.3. *For any $t \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{d}{dt} F_t = G F_t, \tag{4.5}$$

where G is a $\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ matrix such that

$$G(x,y) = \begin{cases} -4\lambda d & \text{if } x = y \text{ and } x \neq O, \\ 2\lambda & \text{if } y \sim x \text{ and } x \neq O, \\ 1 - 2\lambda d & \text{if } x = y = O, \\ 2\lambda d & \text{if } x = O \text{ and } y = e_1, \\ 2\lambda d & \text{if } x = O,\ z \sim e_1 \text{ and } z \neq O, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$.

Proof. (4.5) follows directly from the generator of $\{\zeta_t\}_{t\geq}$ given in (4.2) and Theorem 9.3.1 of [6].

□

Lemma 4.4. *If λ satisfies*

$$GH = \mu H$$

for some $\mu > 0$ and $H : \mathbb{Z}^d \to R$ such that $H(x) > 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then

$$I(\lambda, d) \geq -\mu.$$

Proof. Let $\zeta_0(x) = H(x)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then, according to Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) &= P_{\lambda,d}(\zeta_t(O) > 0) \\ &\geq \frac{[E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t(O)]^2}{E_{\lambda,d}\zeta_t^2(O)} \geq \frac{C^2(\lambda, d, \zeta) t^{-d}}{F_t(O)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

We denote by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the l_∞ norm on $R^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that

$$\|\zeta\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |\zeta(x)|$$

for any $\zeta \in R^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$.

By direct calculation, for any $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in R^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that $\|\zeta_1\|_\infty, \|\zeta_2\|_\infty < +\infty$,

$$\|G\zeta_1 - G\zeta_2\|_\infty \leq (1 + 8\lambda d + 4\lambda d^2)\|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_\infty. \tag{4.8}$$

By (4.8) and classic Theory for ODE on Banach Space, ODE (4.5) has the unique solution such that

$$F_t = \Gamma_t F_0, \tag{4.9}$$

where

$$\Gamma_t = \big(\gamma_t(x,y)\big)_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d, y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} = \exp\{tG\} = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{t^n G^n}{n!}. \tag{4.10}$$

(4.8) ensures the sum in (4.10) is finite. By (4.9),

$$F_t(O) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \gamma_t(O,x)H(x), \tag{4.11}$$

since $F_0 = H$.

Since H is the eigenvector of G with respect to the eigenvalue μ, H is also the eigenvector of $\Gamma_t = e^{tG}$ with respect to the eigenvalue $\exp\{t\mu\}$.

As a result,

$$F_t(O) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \gamma_t(O,x)H(x) = e^{t\mu}H(O). \tag{4.12}$$

By (4.7) and (4.12),

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) \geq \frac{C^2(\lambda,d,\zeta)t^{-d}}{H(O)} e^{-t\mu},$$

and

$$I(\lambda,d) = \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{\lambda,d}(\eta_t^{\delta_1}(O) = 1) \geq -\mu.$$

□

To search λ and μ satisfies the condition in Lemma 4.4, we introduce the simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \{\triangle\}$, where $\triangle \notin Z^d$ is an absorbed state.

For $d \geq 1$ and $p \in [0,1]$, let $\{S_n(d,p) : n = 0,1,2,\ldots\}$ be simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \{\triangle\}$ with transition probability

$$\begin{aligned} &P\big(S_{n+1}(d,p) = y \big| S_n(d,p) = x\big) = \frac{p}{2d}, \\ &P\big(S_{n+1}(d,p) = \triangle \big| S_n(d,p) = x\big) = 1-p, \\ &P\big(S_{n+1}(d,p) = \triangle \big| S_n(d,p) = \triangle\big) = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

for $n \geq 0$, each $x \in Z^d$ and each $y \sim x$.

For $d \geq 1$, $p \in [0,1]$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define

$$\tau(d,p) = \inf\{n \geq 0 : S_n(d,p) = O\}$$

and

$$R(x,d,p) = P\big(\tau(d,p) < +\infty \big| S_0(d,p) = x\big).$$

We will give $H(x)$ with the form $R(x,d,p)$. For this purpose, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *For $d \geq 1$ and each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $R(x,d,p)$ is continuous in p.*

Proof. The conclusion is trivial for $x = O$. For $x \neq O$ and $0 \leq p_1 < p_2 \leq 1$, we construct a coupling for $\{S_n(d,p_1)\}_{n\geq 0}$ and $\{S_n(d,p_2)\}_{n\geq 0}$ with $S_0(d,p_1) = S_0(d,p_2) = x$ such that $S_n(d,p_1) = \triangle$ or $S_n(d,p_1) = S_n(d,p_2) \neq \triangle$ for each $n \geq 1$.

The transition probability matrix $\widehat{P}$ of the coupling process $\{S_n(d,p_1), S_n(d,p_2)\}$ is given by

$$\widehat{P}\big((x_1,y_1),(x_2,y_2)\big) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_1}{2d} & \text{if } x_1 = y_1 \neq \triangle, x_2 = y_2 \sim x_1, \\ 1-p_2 & \text{if } x_1 = y_1 \neq \triangle, x_2 = y_2 = \triangle, \\ \frac{p_2-p_1}{2d} & \text{if } x_1 = y_1 \neq \triangle, x_2 = \triangle, y_2 \sim y_1, \\ \frac{p_2}{2d} & \text{if } x_1 = \triangle, y_1 \neq \triangle, x_2 = \triangle, y_2 \sim y_1, \\ 1-p_2 & \text{if } x_1 = \triangle, y_1 \neq \triangle, x_2 = y_2 = \triangle, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.14}$$

It is easy to check that $\widehat{P}$ gives a coupling of $S_n(d,p_1)$ and $S_n(d,p_2)$ by direct calculation. The coupling ensures that $S_n(d,p_2) = S_n(d,p_1) \neq \triangle$ when $S_n(d,p_1) \neq \triangle$.

As a result, conditioned on $S_0(d,p_1) = S_0(d,p_2) = x$,

$$\begin{aligned} R(x,d,p_2) - R(x,d,p_1) &= P\big(\tau(d,p_1) = +\infty, \tau(d,p_2) < +\infty\big) \\ &\leq P\big(\exists\, n > 0, S_n(d,p_1) = \triangle, S_n(d,p_2) \neq \triangle\big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Let

$$\beta = \inf\{n \geq 1 : S_n(d,p_1) = \triangle, S_n(d,p_2) \neq \triangle\},$$

then, by (4.14) and (4.15),

$$\begin{aligned} R(x,d,p_2) - R(x,d,p_1) &\leq P(\beta < +\infty) = \sum_{l=1}^{+\infty} P(\beta = l) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{+\infty} P(\beta > l-1, S_l(d,p_1) = \triangle, S_l(d,p_2) \neq \triangle) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} P(S_{l-1}(d,p_1) \neq \triangle)(p_2 - p_1) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} p_1^{l-1}(p_2 - p_1) = \frac{p_2 - p_1}{1 - p_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Lemma 4.5 follows from (4.16).

□

Now we give a lower bound for $I(\lambda, d)$.

Lemma 4.6. *For each $d \geq 1$ and $\lambda < \frac{1}{2d}$, there exists unique $p = p(\lambda, d) \in (0,1)$ such that*

$$1 + 2\lambda d R(e_1, d, p) = \frac{4\lambda d}{p}\big[1 - dR(e, d, p)\big]. \tag{4.17}$$

Furthermore,

$$I(\lambda, d) \geq -4\lambda d\big[\frac{1}{p(\lambda, d)} - 1\big] \tag{4.18}$$

for $\lambda < \frac{1}{2d}$.

Proof. For $p \in (0,1]$, we define

$$K(p) = \frac{4\lambda d}{p}\big[1 - dR(e_1, d, p)\big] - 1 - 2\lambda d R(e_1, d, p).$$

It is obviously that $K(p)$ is decreasing in p. By Lemma 4.5, $K(p)$ is continuous in p.

Since $\lambda < \frac{1}{2d}$ and $R(e_1, d, 1) \geq P\big(S_1(d,1) = O\big|S_0(d,1) = e_1\big) = 1/2d$,

$$K(1) < 0. \tag{4.19}$$

Since $R(e_1, d, 0) = 0$,

$$\lim_{p \to 0} K(p) = +\infty. \tag{4.20}$$

The existence and uniqueness of $p(\lambda, d)$ follows from (4.19), (4.20) and the fact that $K(p)$ is continuous and decreasing in p.

Let $\mu = 4\lambda d\big[1/p(\lambda, d) - 1\big]$, $H(x) = R\big(x, d, p(\lambda, d)\big)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then according to the fact that $p(\lambda, d)$ satisfies (4.17) and

$$R(x, d, p) = \frac{p}{2d}\sum_{y: y \sim x} R(y, d, p)$$

for each $x \neq O$, it is easy to check that

$$GH = \mu H.$$

As a result, (4.18) follows from Lemma 4.4.

□

To give a limit theorem of $p(\lambda, d)$, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *For $\{p_d\}_{d=1,2,\ldots}$ such that $p_d \in (0,1)$ for each $d \geq 1$, if*

$$\lim_{d \to +\infty} p_d = c,$$

then

$$\lim_{d \to +\infty} 2dR(e_1, d, p_d) = c.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} R(e_1,d,p_d) &\geq P\big(\tau(d,p_d)=1\big|S_0(d,p_d)=e_1\big) \\ &= P\big(S_1(d,p_d)=O\big|S_0(d,p_d)=e_1\big)=\frac{p_d}{2d}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} R(e_1,d,p_d) &= \frac{p_d}{2d}+P\big(2\leq\tau(d,p_d)<+\infty\big|S_0(d,p_d)=e_1\big) \\ &\leq \frac{p_d}{2d}+P\big(2\leq\tau(d,1)<+\infty\big|S_0(d,1)=e_1\big). \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

According to Lemma 5.3 of [11],

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} dP\big(2\leq\tau(d,1)<+\infty\big|S_0(d,1)=e_1\big)=0. \tag{4.23}$$

Lemma 4.7 follows from (4.21),(4.22) and (4.23).

□

Finally, we give the proof of $\liminf_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d,d)\geq 2\lambda-1$ for $\lambda\in(0,1/2)$.

Proof. For any $\lambda\in(0,1/2)$, we define

$$\overline{c}(\lambda)=\limsup_{d\to+\infty} p(\lambda/d,d)$$

and

$$\underline{c}(\lambda)=\liminf_{d\to+\infty} p(\lambda/d,d).$$

Then by (4.17) and Lemma 4.7,

$$1=\frac{4\lambda}{\overline{c}(\lambda)}\big[1-\frac{\overline{c}(\lambda)}{2}\big]$$

and

$$1=\frac{4\lambda}{\underline{c}(\lambda)}\big[1-\frac{\underline{c}(\lambda)}{2}\big].$$

Therefore,

$$\overline{c}(\lambda)=\underline{c}(\lambda)=c(\lambda)=\frac{4\lambda}{1+2\lambda}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} p(\lambda/d,d)=c(\lambda). \tag{4.24}$$

By (4.18) and (4.24),

$$\liminf_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d,d)\geq -4\lambda[\frac{1}{c(\lambda)}-1]=2\lambda-1$$

for $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$.

$\square$

To finish the proof of Theorem 2.2, we only need to deal with the case where $\lambda = 1/2$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. For $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$, we have shown that

$$\limsup_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d, d) \leq 2\lambda - 1$$

in Section 3 and

$$\liminf_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d, d) \geq 2\lambda - 1$$

in this section. Therefore,

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d, d) = 2\lambda - 1 \tag{4.25}$$

for $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$.

In Section 3, we show that

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} I(\lambda/d, d) = 0 \tag{4.26}$$

for $\lambda > 1/2$. It is obviously that $I(\lambda, d)$ is increasing in λ. Therefore, by (4.25) and (4.26),

$$\lim_{d\to+\infty} I(1/2d, d) = 0. \tag{4.27}$$

Theorem 2.2 follows from (4.25), (4.26) and (4.27).

$\square$

Now the whole proof of Theorem 2.2 is completed. Furthermore, we show that

$$-4\lambda d\big[\frac{1}{p(\lambda, d)} - 1\big] \leq I(\lambda, d) \leq 2\lambda d - 1$$

for $\lambda < 1/2d$, where $p(\lambda, d)$ is the unique solution to

$$1 + 2\lambda d R(e_1, d, p) = \frac{4\lambda d}{p}\big[1 - dR(e, d, p)\big].$$

We give a sketch for the proof of Theorem 2.3.

Proof of 2.3. We only need to show that $\liminf_{d\to+\infty} J(\lambda/d, d) \geq 2\lambda - 1$ for $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$.

Let $\{\alpha_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ be Markov processes with state space $[0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that the generator $\widetilde{\Omega}$ of $\{\alpha_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\Omega}f(\alpha) = &\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\big[f(\alpha^{x,0})-f(\alpha)\big]\\ &+\lambda\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\sum_{y:y\sim x}\big[f(\alpha^{x,\alpha(x)+\alpha(y)})-f(\alpha)\big]+\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}(1-2\lambda d)f_x'(\alpha)\alpha(x),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha^{x,m}(y)=\begin{cases}\alpha(y) & \text{if } y\neq x,\\ m & \text{if } y=x\end{cases}$$

for $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $m\geq 0$.

When $\alpha_0(x)>0$ for each $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, then according to a similar analysis with that in the proof of Lemma 4.1,

$$\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } \alpha_t(O)=1,\\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha_t(O)=0\end{cases}$$

in the sense of coupling and hence

$$P_{\lambda,d}(\beta_t^{\delta_1}(O)=1)=P_{\lambda,d}(\alpha_t(O)>0)\geq\frac{\big[E_{\lambda,d}\alpha_t(O)\big]^2}{E_{\lambda,d}\alpha_t^2(O)}. \tag{4.28}$$

We define $\widetilde{F}:[0,+\infty)\to[0,+\infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that

$$\widetilde{F}_t(x)=E_{\lambda,d}\big[\alpha_t(O)\alpha_t(x)\big]$$

for $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $t\geq 0$. Then,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\widetilde{F}_t=\widetilde{G}\widetilde{F}_t,$$

where $\widetilde{G}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}^d\times\mathbb{Z}^d$ matrix such that

$$\widetilde{G}(x,y)=\begin{cases}2\lambda & \text{if } x\neq O, y\sim x,\\ -4\lambda d & \text{if } x\neq O, y=x,\\ 1-2\lambda d & \text{if } x=y=O,\\ 4\lambda d & \text{if } x=O, y=e_1,\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

When $\lambda<\frac{1}{2d}$, according to a similar analysis with that in the proof of Lemma 4.6, there exists unique $\widetilde{p}=\widetilde{p}(\lambda,d)$ such that

$$\frac{4\lambda d}{\widetilde{p}}-2\lambda d=1+4\lambda dR(e_1,d,\widetilde{p}).$$

Let $\widetilde{\mu} = 4\lambda d\big[1/\widetilde{p} - 1\big]$ and $\widetilde{H}(x) = R(x, d, \widetilde{p})$ for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then

$$\widetilde{G}\widetilde{H} = \widetilde{\mu}\widetilde{H}.$$

According to (4.28) and a similar analysis with that in the proof of Lemma 4.4,

$$J(\lambda, d) \geq -\widetilde{\mu}$$

for $\lambda < \frac{1}{2d}$.

Since $R(e_1, d, \widetilde{p}) \leq R(e_1, d, 1) \to 0$ as $d \to +\infty$,

$$\lim_{d \to +\infty} \widetilde{p}(\lambda/d, d) = \frac{4\lambda}{1 + 2\lambda}$$

for $\lambda < 1/2$. As a result,

$$\liminf_{d \to +\infty} J(\lambda/d, d) \geq -4\lambda\big[\frac{1 + 2\lambda}{4\lambda} - 1\big] = 2\lambda - 1$$

for $\lambda < 1/2$.

$\square$

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China with grant number 11171342.

References

[1] Andjel, E. D., Liggett, T. M. and Mountford, T. (1992). Clustering in one-dimensional threshold voter models. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* **42**, 73-90.

[2] Cox, J. T. and Durrett, R. (1991). Nonlinear voter models. In *Random Walks, Brownian Motion and Interacting Particle Systems. A Festschrift in Honor of Frank Spiter* 189-201. Birkhäuser, Boston.

[3] Fontes, L. R., Schonmann, R. H. (2008). Threshold $\theta \geq 2$ contact processes on homogeneous trees. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **141**, 513-541.

[4] Griffeath, D. (1983). The Binary Contact Path Process. *The Annals of Probability* **11** 692-705.

[5] Handjani, S. (1999). The complete convergence theorem for coexistent threshold voter models. *The Annals of Probability* **27** 226-245.

[6] Liggett, T. M. (1985). *Interacting Particle Systems.* Springer, New York.

[7] Liggett, T. M. (1994). Coexistence in threshold voter models. *The Annals of Probability*. **22**, 764-802.

[8] Liggett, T. M. (1999). *Stochastic interacting systems: contact, voter and exclusion processes.* Springer, New York.

[9] Mountford, T. and Schonmann, R. H. (2009) The survival of large dimensional threshold contact processes. *The Annals of Probability* **37**, 1483-1501.

[10] Xue, XF. (2012). Critical density points for threshold voter models on homogeneous trees. *Journal of Statistical Physics*. **146**, 423-433.

[11] Xue, XF. (2014). Asymptotic behavior of critical infection rates for threshold-one contact processes on lattices and regular trees. *Journal of Theoretical Probability.* Published online on February 2014.

[12] Xue, XF. (2015). Fluid limit of threshold voter models on tori. *Journal of Statistical Physics.* Published online on January 2015.